Internal Revenue Service memorandum

CC:TL-N-Br2:RLOsborne

date: DFC 2.0 1988

to: District Counsel, Dallas, Texas

Attn: George Gasper

from: Assistant Chief Counsel (Tax Litigation) CC:TL

subject:

We hereby respond to the December 7, 1988 request for advice.

ISSUES

- 1. In what form should forms 872 and 977 be executed in connection with
- 2. In what form should forms 872 and 977 be executed in connection with

FACTS

The group's taxable years through are under audit. The file reflects Forms 872 for those years for executed by the general partner of "successor to "extending the statute of limitations to "The file also reflects Forms 977 for those years for the "General Partner -- "extending the statute of limitations to "extending the statute of limitations to "extending the statute of limitations to "you have asked in what forms new consents should be executed.

From late through early ") liquidated its subsidiaries and transferred its assets tol in exchange for limited partnership interests. Then dissolved and distributed its limited partnership interests to its shareholders, who thereby became limited partners in . assumed 's liabilities, including transferred the assets to obligations. The group's taxable years and are under The file reflects Forms 872 for those years for executed by . extending the statute of limitations to . The file also reflects Forms 872 for those years for ' executed by the general partner of _____, "successor to ," extending the statute of limitations to You have asked in what forms new consents should be

DISCUSSION

executed.

The Forms 872 executed for by the general partner of as successor are probably invalid. was not a successor to or and appears to have had no authority to extend the statute of limitations on behalf of those corporations.

The Forms 977 executed by

successor to

are probably valid, assuming they were timely signed
(which is not clear from the file).

Rather, under the

Purchase

was a transferee. Moreover, the transferee is really not
itself. However, while the matter is not totally without
litigation risk, the wording is probably a sufficient
acknowledgment that

was acting on behalf of
transferee. The subject Forms 977 extended the statute of
limitations until

Under the was of Sale and Purchase, was to assume the liabilities had assumed from Accordingly, was a transferee of a transferee. Under IRC § 6901(c)(2), the statute of limitations as to expires one year after the statute of limitations expires as to the prior transferee. Accordingly, the statute of limitations as to will expire in the limitations as to has indicated that it will be willing to execute a Form 977 prior to the deadlines if further time is needed for the audit.

We understand that spun off one of its subsidiaries a few years ago. The assets of that subsidiary cannot be reached under the Forms 977 discussed above. Such assets could only be reached by obtaining a consent from that subsidiary individually, or by obtaining the consent of as agent for the entire group. As to and and the things are the statute of limitations as agent for the entire appears to have expired with respect to such an option. However, would still be open. was dissolved in . Under Article 7.12 of the Texas Business Corporation Act, as then in effect, upon dissolution a corporation could still be sued. However, the statute did not state that for winding up purposes a dissolved corporation's existence actually continued. Moreover, even if s existence is deemed to have continued for winding up purposes under Texas law, it may have terminated for purposes of Treas. Reg. 1.1502-77(d), which deals with the power to act as agent for group members. Accordingly, even with respect to the taxable year, there is some question as to whether could at this time execute a Form 872 as agent.

The Forms 872 signed by signed by signed 's president regarding 's individual tax liability (which is the liability to pay the tax owed by the entire group) appear to be valid. By the time those forms were signed, had dissolved. However, under Section 278 of the Delaware General Corporation Law, continued in existence for three years for the purpose of winding up its affairs. Accordingly, sign 's president could still sign the extensions. Associates Investment Co. v. Comm'r, 69 T.C. 441 (1972). The consents extended the statute of limitations until

Because does not have assets any longer, no further consents for are worthwhile. The major relevance of the existing consents is that they automatically extend the statute of limitations for transferees. The Securities and Exchange Commission disclosure documentation we reviewed indicates that mever assumed the liabilities of Accordingly, we assume that was not a transferee with respect to the tax obligations of the group. However, the Conveyance and Assumption Agreement between and and shows that assumed is liabilities, including is tax liabilities. Accordingly, is a transferee of the Under IRC § 6901(c)(1), is transferee liability expires one year after the expiration of the transferor's liability. Since is liability expires on the work of the sindicated that it will sign a Form 977 a few months prior to that date if further time is needed to complete the audit.

CONCLUSION

Most of the assets the Service could possibly reach with respect to tax obligations are now in the possession of

which appears to have transferee liability. The period of assessments as to will under existing consents will expire on and will as agent for the group for in order to reach the assets of the subsidiary which spun off a few years ago. You may also wish to obtain a Form 872 directly from that subsidiary. With respect to will stax obligations, all of the assets the Service could possibly reach are now in the possession of will, which appears to have transferee liability. The period of assessments as to will under existing consents will expire on

MARLENE GROSS

By:

ALFRED C. BISHOP, JR. Chief, Branch No. 2

Tax Litigation Division